

UNCLASSIFIED

Instruction to Foster from Secretary, May 9, 1967

Foster instructed to state following orally to Soviets:

"With reference paper given Soviet Co-Chairman April 28, 1967 entitled 'Questions on Draft NPT asked by US allies together with answers given by US', I should like make clear this not intended as formal instrument or secret understanding connected with NPT. Rather as I stated then, these are answers we have given our allies in reply their questions concerning Articles I and II. Since, for reasons well known to Sov Govt, these articles deal only with what is prohibited, our allies were naturally anxious to know how they might affect NATO defense arrangements and procedures as well as possible future political evolution of Western Europe.

"As is now evident, there are no surprises in our replies; these points have been mentioned in our past discussions, beginning with FonMin Gromyko-Secretary Rusk talks at end last year. We expect similar questions will be asked during our Senate hearings on NPT and we have assured our allies we will give these same responses because they state our understanding of Articles I and II. Our allies may encounter similar questions in course parliamentary discussions on NPT and they will also be able draw on these replies.

"Therefore, while these responses have only the status I have indicated, they are basic to our attitude toward the NPT. We do not require any Soviet comment on these interpretations, but it should be clear that if at this late date Soviets should take an official position in opposition to these interpretations of the Treaty, very serious problems would arise which would have to be resolved."

Report of Foster conversation with Soviets on May 11, 1967

Foster said he had been instructed to make explanation of interpretations handed Soviets on April 28 and read off explanation per reftel. Roshchin said he fully understood and that explanation was only a clarification of meaning of answers in our Q and A interpretations. Foster reiterated that interpretations were not formal document or party of Treaty but our interpretations of Arts I and II. Same ideas probably would be enunciated during Senate hearings on Treaty and possibly in consideration by other parliaments. Roshchin said he understood, and other two nodded affirmatively.

UNCLASSIFIED